

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hawkins, U.S. Patent No. 6,000,000 (Hawkins). In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of all pending claims.

Hawkins does *not* teach, as argued, determining whether Applications A-C or the file system manager needs to be updated, let alone causing the server to provide an update to the file system manager or Applications A-C if needed. Rather, the cited sections of Hawkins relate to a method for synchronizing databases on the handheld device with databases on a computer system. While Hawkins may describe updating a database, Hawkins makes a clear distinction between databases in the applications such as Applications A-C and the presumed file system manager executing on the handheld device 110.

The Final Office Action argues that Hawkins' updating is applicable to either programs (applications) or databases, citing column 5, lines 40-47 and column 3, lines 15-26 in support thereof. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Abstract of Hawkins makes clear that if the user gets a new application for the handheld computer system and the personal computer system, then a new library of code is added for synchronizing the databases associated with the new application.

Thus, with respect to new applications added to the handheld and the personal computer system, the library code is added for synchronizing the databases associated with the new applications, not synchronizing the applications. Column 3, lines 15 -26, which was cited in the Final Office Action, is consistent with the Abstract. Column 3, lines 15-26 states:

Each conduit library performs a synchronization for one particular application. The conduit libraries call a set of synchronization functions provided within the sync manager library. After the hotsync memory resident program has executed all the conduit libraries, the hotsync memory resident program informs the user that the synchronization process has completed.

Hawkins states that each library performs a synchronization for one particular application. In other words, each library performs a synchronization of the databases that are used by a particular application. Column 3, lines 15-26 do not teach or fairly suggest determining whether the application needs to be updated, but alone providing to the handheld device an application update. Applicants assert the Final Office Action rejections of the claims are in error.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5093.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric A. Stephenson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099